



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/577,188	05/24/2000	Rahul Sharma	A-69408/SFC/DCA	7397

32291 7590 09/11/2003

MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE
SUITE 170
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085

EXAMINER

ENG, DAVID Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/577,188

Applicant(s)

SHARMA, RAHUL

Examiner

DAVID Y. ENG

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim 1 has been cancelled. The active claims are 2-11.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 2-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 2-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Details of the rejection have already been set forth in the last Office action. The details are incorporated herein by reference thereto.

In response to the 112, first paragraph rejection, Applicant points to certain excerpts in the specification for support of the claims. The Examiner has carefully studied those excerpts. The Examiner is unable to find support of the resource adapter as claimed in the excerpts identified by Applicant. Applicant fails to explain how the descriptions in the identified excerpts support the resource adapter as claimed. For example, Applicant points to lines 3-5 of page 4 for support of the resource adapter recited in claim 2. The excerpt merely corresponds a resource adapter module 206 to a J2EE module. How that is related to the claimed resource adapter is really out of the Examiner's imagination. Applicant further contends that some terms or devices in the

Art Unit: 2155

claims are well known in the art. Firstly, those terms or devices per se may be well known. Those terms or devices as claimed are not well known. For example, it may be well known that native libraries are collections of precompiled routines. However, native libraries required by the resource adapter for enabling connections to the enterprise information system as claimed are not well known. More example, java classes and interfaces respectively may be well known. However, java classes and interfaces together for implementing connector contracts and functionality of the resource adapter as claimed are not well known. The specification fails to disclose a resource adapter as claimed and how the resource adapter as recited is able to provide services offered by the enterprise information system.

As to the exemplary source code, the Examiner has carefully studied the description in pages 13-20. The description is totally unrelated to the claims. There is nothing in pages 13-20 which is able to support recitations of the claim.

As to the remarks directed to the 112, second paragraph rejection, there is no functional relationship recited between components or method steps of the resource adapter such that desired results set forth in the preambles can be achieved. For example, it is not seen how the java classes and interfaces recited for implementing connector contracts and functionality of the resource adapter, the native libraries recited for enabling connections to the enterprise information system, the meta information recited for enabling the relation of the java classes, the interfaces and the native libraries and the deployment descriptor recited for enabling deployment of the resource adapter in a target operational environment functionally co-act with each other such that

the resource adapter is able to collaborate with an application server to provide services offered by the enterprise information system as set forth in the preamble. Further, recitation or description of the claim components is not clear. For example, libraries, information and descriptor all are collection of information. The information by itself is unable to perform any function. Method claims have similar defects. Applicants fail to provide any explanation as to how the amendment overcome the rejection. See 37 CFR 1.111c.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.



DAVID Y. ENG
PRIMARY EXAMINER